DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 763 HE 002 266

TITLE	The Expansion of Equal Educational Opportunities; An Evaluation Study of the New York State Higher Education Opportunity Program. Final Report, Part Two.
INSTITUTION	Human Affairs Research Center, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE	Jun 70
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Counseling, *Disadvantaged Youth, Educationally Disadvantaged, *Equal Education, *Evaluation, Financial Support, *Higher Education, *Special Programs, Tutoring
IDENTIFIERS	*New York Higher Education Opportunity Program

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP), the primary purpose of which is to expand equal educational opportunities to the economically and educationally disadvantaged youth of New York State (1) who are graduates of approved high schools or holders of a New York State high school equivalency diploma, and (2) who are potentially able to successfully complete a postsecondary education program. Chapter I describes the origin and general structure of HEOP; Chapter 2 summarizes HEOP practices in the participating institutions; Chapter 3 discusses the dimensions of the program as can be gleaned from statistical data; and the final chapter discusses the implications for the future of the program. (AF)

ED051763

Final Report
Part Two

N-SG
HE

The Expansion of Equal Educational Opportunities

An Evaluation Study of the
NEW YORK STATE HIGHER EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

June 1970

HE 002 766

Prepared by
THE HUMAN AFFAIRS RESEARCH CENTER
under contract with
THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

1

ED051763

FINAL REPORT
PART TWO

This volume, Part Two of The Higher Education Opportunity Program's final report, is the first section of the evaluation study conducted by The Human Affairs Research Center. Included are the results of their study along with recommendations to the State Education Department.

The materials contained in this volume were prepared by The Human Affairs Research Center and do not necessarily reflect judgments of the State Education Department.

ED218123

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
Regents of the University (with years when terms expire)

1984 Joseph W. McGovern, A.B., LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D., D.C.L.,
Chancellor -New York

1985 Everett J. Penny, B.C.S., D.C.S.,
Vice Chancellor -White Plains

1978 Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D.- - - - - - - - - - - Troy

1973 Charles W. Millard., Jr., A.B., LL.D., L.H.D.- - - - - - - - Buffalo

1972 Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.A., D.C.S., H.H.D.- - -Purchase

1975 Edward M.M. Warburg, B.S., L.H.D.- - - - - - - - - - - - - - New York

1977 Joseph T. King, LL.B.- Queens

1974 Joseph C. Indelicato, M.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Brooklyn

1976 Mrs. Helen B. Power, A.B., Litt.D., L.H.D.- - - - - - - - - -Rochester

1979 Francis W. McGinley, B.S., LL.B., LL.D.- - - - - - - - - - - Glens Falls

1980 Max J. Rubin, LL.B., L.H.D.- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - New York

1971 Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D. Litt.D.- - - - - - - -Hastings on Hudson

1982 Stephen K. Bailey, A.B., B.A., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D.- - - - - Syracuse

1983 Harold E. Newcomb, B.A.- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Owego

1981 Theodore M. Black, A.B.- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Sands Point

<u>President of the University and Commissioner of Education</u>
Ewald B. Nyquist

<u>Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education</u>
Gordon M. Ambach

<u>Associate Commissioner for Higher Education</u>
Albert H. Berrian

<u>Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education</u>
Alvin P. Lierheimer

<u>Coordinator, Higher Education Opportunity Program</u>
Donald M. Winkelman

PREFACE

Expansion of equal educational opportunities is one of the most pressing issues in our society. The State of New York, through the instrumentality of the Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP), has made another major effort toward its goal of equal access to higher education for all its citizens.

The Governor, Legislature, Regents, Commissioner of Education and their staffs are commended. It is anticipated that everyone associated with HEOP will intensify his efforts to improve and expand higher educational opportunities for all students.

The Human Affairs Research Center is pleased to have been a part of the Higher Education Opportunity Program. On behalf of the young men and women who participated in the 1969-70 Higher Education Opportunity Program, the Human Affairs Research Center is presumptuous enough to say to the State of New York, thank you.

STUDY TEAM

Mr. Lloyd L. Hogan, *Study Director*
Miss Marilyn Geels, *Associate Study Director*
Dr. Edward Henderson, *Assistant Study Director, New York University*

Mr. Thomas Azumbrado, *Board of Education of the City of New York*
Dr. Brian Blake, *St. John's University*
Dr. Warren Button, *SUNY Buffalo*
Dr. Virgil Clift, *New York University*
Dr. Hilda O. Fortune, *York College*
Mr. Albert P. Gabrielli, *Human Affairs Research Center*
Dr. Raymond Klein, *Human Affairs Research Center*
Miss Anita Kuperus, *Human Affairs Research Center*
Dr. W. A. Low, *University of Maryland*
Miss Arlene Mantell, *New York University*
Mr. James Patterson, *Human Affairs Research Center*
Dr. Ed J. Ponder, *New York University*
Dr. Sylvia Seidman, *Hofstra University*
Dr. Alice Padawer-Singer, *Long Island University*
Dr. Robert Zenhausern, *St. John's University*

STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT HEOP TEAM

Mr. Donald Winkelman
Mr. Armand Altman
Mr. Eugene Ellis
Mr. Gene Herman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART TWO

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Origins	
	Objectives	
	Authorized Activities	
	Annual Reporting	
	Structure of the Evaluation Study	
	The Financial Magnitude	
	The Participating Institutions	
	The Population Served	
	The Program	
	The Coordinating Role of the State Education Department	
II	SUMMARY OF HEOP PRACTICES	8
	Administration	
	Planning	
	Coordination	
	Cooperation between Colleges	
	Counseling	
	Recruitment	
	Tutoring	
	Curriculum	
	Remediation	
	Summer Programs	
	Community Involvement	
	Facilities	
	Personal Financial Allowances	
	Student Activity Involvement	
	Work Experience	
	Housing	
	Group Identification with a Special HEOP	
III	THE DIMENSIONS OF THE PROGRAM	26
	Per Student State Aid Allocations	
	Program Elements	
	HEOP Enrollment	
	Characteristics of HEOP Students	
	Student Retention Rates	
	Occupational Goals of HEOP Students	

IV GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS 35
The Coordinating Role of the State Department
Funding of HEOP
Planning of HEOP Programs
Cooperation between Colleges
A Statewide Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged

V IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF HEOP 39
The Medium in Which HEOP Operates
The Legal Framework
Some Implications

PART THREE

VI THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM IN INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS 1
Introduction
Objectives
Target Population
Activities
Staff
Facilities
Community Involvement
Budget
HEOP Curriculum Pattern
Effectiveness
Recommendations

APPENDIX A
Revised Budget Data 220
APPENDIX B
List of Institutions and Directors 222

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Origins

In 1966, a state program was instituted to advance the cause of equality of educational opportunity in the City University of New York (CUNY). This program came to be known as Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge (SEEK). A similar program was extended later to some units of the State University of New York (SUNY). In 1969, a similar program was extended to the private colleges and universities under the Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP).

Section 6451 of the education law, as added by chapter 1077 of the laws of 1969, gave birth to the HEOP program on a statewide basis, involving CUNY, SUNY and the private colleges and universities under the aegis of the Board of Regents. The law made available an appropriation of $5 million for implementing its provisions.

Objectives

The primary objective of HEOP implicit in the law is to expand equal educational opportunities to the economically and educationally disadvantaged youth of New York State (a) who are graduates of approved high schools or holders of a New York State high school equivalency diploma and (b) who are potentially able to successfully complete a postsecondary education program.

Authorized Activities

The law is specific about the kinds of activities which HEOP funds may support; no exceptions are allowed. The specific activities allowable are

--special testing, counseling and guidance services in the course of screening potential enrollees;

--remedial courses and summer classes;

--special tutoring, counseling and guidance services; and

--necessary supplemental financial assistance, to include stipends and books.

The law is further restrictive. The regular academic program of any institution participating in HEOP must definitely not be supported by HEOP grants-in-aid. And in no case shall any program supported with HEOP funds be incompatible with the Regents Statewide Plan for the expansion and development of higher education.

Annual Reporting

The law finally directs the Commissioner of Education to prepare an annual report of the activities of the institutions which receive state funds for HEOP activities. This report should include, but not be limited to--

--the effectiveness of each of the programs;
--the costs of the programs; and
--the future plans of the programs.

Under contract with the New York State Education Department, Human Affairs Research Center (HARC) has conducted an evaluation study of the HEOP program during the 1969-70 school year. This document represents the results of that study.

The study is circumscribed by the framework of law. Its approach, methods, and recommendations are to be understood within these restrictions. No attempt is made to question the efficacy of the program from the standpoint of the legislative mandates

which define its boundaries. These are taken as given parameters of the study. In a chapter on the future implications of the program, however, HARC speaks directly to these limitations.

Structure of the Evaluation Study

The study is organized in two parts--Part Two and Part Three. In Part Two, the present chapter describes the origin and general structure of HEOP. A second chapter summarized HEOP practices in the participating institutions. A third chapter discusses the dimensions of the program as can be gleaned from some of the statistical data. A fourth chapter makes general recommendations about the program as a whole. And finally, a fifth chapter discusses the implications for the future of the program.

Part Three describes the program in each of the participating colleges. For each institution it describes objectives, target population, activities, staff, facilities, community involvement, budget, and curriculum patterns. The effectiveness of the program in each college is discussed and certain recommendations for improving the program are made where these appear to be appropriate.

The Financial Magnitude

The total appropriation for the operation of HEOP during the 1969-70 year was $5 million. Institutions were invited to submit proposals for approval by the New York State Education Department for allocations from these funds. The total volume of funds requested was $16 million. As a consequence, $11 million worth of requests had to be disapproved because of the limited funds available.

The Participating Institutions

Approximately 90 institutions applied for grants-in-aid under the HEOP program. Of these, 49 received approval of $5 million out of a total request approximating $10 million. Among the approved institutions were 8 units of SUNY, 5 units of CUNY, nine public community colleges or agricultural and technical institutes and 27 private colleges and universities. Some of the programs were operated by consortiums of institutions.

These institutions varied in size of undergraduate enrollment from 225 at the State University College (SUC) at Old Westbury to 13,000 at New York University.

The Population Served

The students served by the HEOP program met the statutory requirements for the target population. It was estimated by HARC consultants that slightly over 8,500 were involved during the first year. Mount St. Vincent College enrolled nine students in its program as contrasted with New York University which enrolled 535. All other institutions enrolled HEOP students somewhere between these two extremes. The SEEK program at various units of CUNY enrolled an estimated total of 4,300 students.

More particularly, the units of SUNY enrolled 1,462 students, the units of CUNY (including the SEEK program) enrolled 5,146 students, the public community colleges enrolled 474 students, and the private institutions enrolled 1,455 students.

The Program

The programs at the various institutions complied with the requirements of the law. They included instruction,

tutoring, remediation, counseling, and stipends (books, tuition, room, board, transportation).

Table 1 indicates the relative importance of these program elements in terms of amounts of state aid allocated by types of insituttions.

The Coordinating Role of the State Education Department

One of the main objectives of the HEOP Central Office, spelled out in the enabling legislation, is to coordinate the efforts of all colleges in the expansion of equal educational opportunities. This role has been the responsibility of a small unit operating out of the Division of Higher and Professional Education in the New York State Education Department.

The unit consists of a director and three professionals. In May of 1969, they were notified of the signing of the legislation. Within one month, they prepared and distributed guidelines for the program and for funding. Within another month, they had made the allocations to all the colleges now participating in the program.

During the year, this team made at least 150 visits to the various colleges in the program; a similar number of visits were made to other institutions of higher learning. They also published two issues of Educational Opportunity Forum. This publication covers a wide range of topics in the field of higher education for disadvantaged youth.

The purposes of the above visits involved more than the evaluation of the individual programs. The State HEOP personnel sought to serve as consultative sources as well.

The directors of a sampling of HEOP programs were queried about their awareness of the role played by the State HEOP staff in the coordination of these programs. Criticisms of

the helpfulness of these visits and suggestions for improvement were also elicited. The following generalizations were drawn from these interviews:

1. Some directors felt that, while initially in some instances the HEOP staff members arrived with too many preconceived ideas and opinions, they were responsive, interested, cordial, and helpful.
2. The HEOP staff understood the problems the various programs were coping with, offered useful criticisms, and made suggestions that were helpful. The written followup reports received by the directors were also appreciated although they wanted more feedback in writing. They would also have preferred to receive more descriptive and less statistical materials.
3. Several directors recommended more visitations and wanted more help from the State HEOP staff.
4. The HEOP directors expressed disappointment that the proposal for a directors' conference was not followed through.
5. The encouragement at the State level of the formation of more consortia was recommended so that resources could be pooled and the competition for funds and students could be lessened.
6. The HEOP directors did not feel, particularly in the first year of their programs, that the requirements for reports were excessive.
7. The directors felt that the guidelines for writing proposals requesting HEOP funds should be simplified.

Table 1
Approved State Aid For Selected Types of HEOP Activities
By Type of Institution
New York State, 1969–70

Type of Activity	Type of Institution				Total
	Private	SUNY	CUNY*	Public Community Colleges*	
Credit Instruction	$118,425	$ 73,300	$ 36,070	$ 22,100	$ 249,895
Non-Credit Instruction and Remediation	97,185	11,379	1,276,955	47,920	1,433,439
Tutoring	124,567	40,925	143,060	25,480	334,032
Counseling	204,064	95,017	277,250	59,075	635,406
Stipends**	225,666	446,600	841,058	132,850	1,646,174
Central Administration and Coordination**	135,575	29,083	298,430	24,746	487,834
Travel	7,950	9,950	1,650	100	19,650
Total	$913,432	$706,254	$2,874,473	$312,271	$4,806,430

*Community Colleges sponsored by the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York are included in CUNY. Agricultural and Technical Institutes are included in Public Community Colleges.

**Stipends include books, room, food, tuition and transportation. Central Administration and Coordination include primarily employee benefits; a small proportion constitutes salaries of directors or coordinators

CHAPTER II

SUMMARY OF HEOP PRACTICES

This chapter will present a general summary of HEOP practices drawn primarily from the descriptive data collected by the HEOP evaluation consultants during their site visits. Examples cited are illustrative only and reflect practices in many institutions other than the ones mentioned.

Administration

A variable which seems to make an important difference in the quality of HEOP programs is the capability of the program director. Active, energetic, and positive leadership that particularly emphasizes attention to students' needs is consistently found in excellent HEOP programs. In these programs, the director is easily accessible to the students and is usually very well "tuned in" to the community as well. The effective director tends to maintain an open door policy with his students, frequently stating that his students can't wait; their problems or needs are often so intense that they must be met immediately. It should be apparent that it is vital for the director to maintain this quality of relationship with his staff as well.

Examples of outstanding administrative practices are to be found at SUNY-Binghamton, Colgate University, Corning Community College and the EOP program at Brooklyn College.

Planning

Several colleges depend on advisory committees to help plan and operate their HEOP programs. These committees often include faculty members from either within the program itself or from departments throughout the college.

Increasingly, students have also been included in these committees. In a few programs, community representation is also included on these advisory committees.

The committees at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Mohawk Valley Community College, SUNY-Binghamton and the CUNY-Bilingual are composed of faculty members and HEOP staff members. These committees serve as a communication link between the HEOP students and the schools.

The committees at Corning Community College, Ithaca College, SUC at Cobleskill and SUC at Cortland include students. The opportunity to help plan and run the programs at these schools has given the students a sense of the relevancy of the program.

Students share in the planning at Fordham University and SUC at Oswego, although not in a formal committee.

In the EOP program at Brooklyn College an elected student advisory committee to the director has an effective voice in virtually all operations of the program.

Most CUNY SEEK programs utilize student committees in the operations of their programs. At University Center, for example, new SEEK staff members are screened, interviewed, and selected by a committee composed of SEEK students, faculty, and administration.

The HEOP program at Syracuse University was originated by a group of Black students who wanted to help their disadvantaged peers. No faculty or administration was involved.

Students are involved in the continuous planning and developing of innovations at the Cooperative College Center.

Coordination

There is a need to coordinate different programs for the disadvantaged within certain institutions.

At Marist College, information and techniques are shared with the Upward Bound Program. Upward Bound also serves as a source of students for their HEOP. At Manhattanville, recruiting efforts are shared by different programs within the school.

At New York University, the Vice Chancellor's office serves as a central information center.

As might be surmised, the larger the institution and the more diversified the programs they offer the disadvantaged, the more difficult the coordination of these programs becomes both within the institution and with community agencies outside the institution. At Brooklyn College, for example, the Small College Program, the SEEK program, and the EOP operate virtually independently of each other.

Cooperation between Colleges

Consortia of colleges have been formed to make possible the sharing of physical and human resources. Examples of these associations are those of Union, RPI, and Skidmore (Academic Opportunity Consortium); Staten Island Community College, Richmond College, Wagner, and Notre Dame College; and Manhattan, Marymount Manhattan, Mercy, Marymount-Tarrytown, and Mount Saint Vincent Colleges (Community Leadership Consortium). These consortia have shared such program aspects as facilities, staff, and program planning.

A good example of consortium activity is the development of the Special Opportunity Program of the Wyandanch Center for Higher Education. This consortium is composed of six Long Island colleges: SUC at Old Westbury, Suffolk Community College, A and T Institute at Farmingdale, SUNY at Stony Brook, Dowling College, and Hofstra University working in cooperation with the Wyandanch Public School System.

The Wyandanch Center was formed to meet the needs of residents of the Wyandanch area for programs of liberal and technical education. This economically depressed area has long needed more readily accessible higher education services. The six institutions have contributed to the development of the Wyandanch Center by providing talent for program planning, for conceptualizing the curriculum by a consortium curriculum committee, for finding staff and, in a few instances, providing staff on a part time basis. This cooperative venture appears to have worked effectively. It was seen as a model to other institutions for combining resources to meet the educational needs of a community.

Another type of cooperative approach is represented in the SEEK program at CUNY. The University Center of City College was first conceived as a experimental college center for developing and researching effective approaches to meeting the educational needs of disadvantaged students. More recently another function for University Center has evolved. This has been to accept for intensive remedial help, students who are highly vulnerable to failure and, after preparing them, to serve as a feeder school for the four year units of CUNY.

Counseling

In most of the HEOP Programs, where the resources were available, counseling was heavily emphasized. A common and significant practice has been to increase the counselor-to-student ratio since the experience has been that HEOP students have more adjustment difficulties than the typical college student. They also have many problems to cope with in their personal lives; they need motivational support and bolstering of self-esteem and they need consistent followup in their academic activities.

A few colleges, such as Marymount-Tarrytown, with small HEOP enrollments have resorted to the use of part-time counselors. This practice has been found to be unsuccessful.

Some colleges have resorted to the use of the regular counseling staff to work with HEOP students. In the cases where the regular staff is predominantly of white middle-class backgrounds, it has been difficult for the minority students to develop a trusting relationship with these counselors.

It is a desirable practice for colleges to employ counselors of the same ethnic background as that of the students they counsel. The difficulty is in finding sufficient numbers of well-trained black and Puerto Rican counselors. Partly for this reason, the practice of hiring junior level counselors to augment the regular counseling staff has evolved. Often these junior level counselors have proved very effective.

A study-skills supervisor has been used successfully in a counseling role at the Hamilton-Kirkland Colleges.

Counselors' roles have been broadened so that some may now be considered counselor-teachers and teacher-counselors. SUNY-Albany has innovated in this way; and The Brooklyn SEEK program is developing a counselor-mentor-teacher position for SEEK classes in English and social studies where each instructor assumes the counseling and responsibilities of a group of approximately 20 students that he teaches.

The special center for counseling and tutoring at SUNY-Binghamton is worthy of note. The personnel in the center are very sensitive to the needs of the students and provide a sense of belonging. They also have counselors in the dormitories.

The "Big Brother" program at Colgate is another example of providing help for the HEOP students.

The University of Rochester counseling program helps students to find career-oriented summer jobs. The students earn money and have career experiences at the same time.

Many College counselors follow-up on students after they have dropped out of the program. An example of one such college is the University College of Syracuse University.

In practice, as suggested above, approaches to counseling vary a great deal among HEOP programs. Many counselors eschew counseling that contains deep psychological involvement of the student. They prefer instead to focus on "reality counseling " to quickly help the student see what he is confronting and to orient him as to how he should cope with his problems. This is highly directive counseling.

In more rare instances, counselors do follow nondirective and introspective approaches. There are points, however, about which all the counseling programs tend to concur:

1. The counselor has to have the competence and inclination to help the student with his problems. He cannot focus on educational problems alone since the problems the student is likely to be facing may have to do with family discord, obtaining welfare help for a parent, getting a member of the family out of jail, obtaining medical care, or a myriad of other intensely personal and complex problems.

2. Counseling help must be available immediately when the student needs it. Often the problems are urgent and the student may leave the program if he is not helped quickly.

3. It takes time for some HEOP students to form trusting relationships with their counselors. Many of them have had negative experiences with counselors in high schools and elementary schools.

4. An opportunity student may find it very difficult to admit to any one that he is in academic difficulty. He often cannot confront the loss of face involved in admitting failure since he may have failed in academic work in the past.

5. Continuous and close working relationships between the counselor and student are necessary. In large colleges, the student may become susceptible to the forces of depersonalization. Often the counselor is the key person in maintaining personal contact between the student and the school.

Counseling programs differ in the types of relationships between counselors and students emphasized. Most of the programs provide an extensive orientation for beginning students. In some programs, weekly group counseling sessions are held where attendance is mandatory. In others,

individual sessions are held where attendance is mandatory. There are also programs where contacts are made on a less formal basis with the counselor calling the student in if the student stops coming in voluntarily, or if he becomes aware of the student's having academic or other difficulties.

Recruitment

SUC at Cortland, Union College, Keuka College, Utica College, SUNY-Binghamton, SUNY-Buffalo, Colgate University, and many others have all been successful in using flexible nonacademic criteria in selecting disadvantaged students. The special techniques include personal interviews, recommendations, motivation, goals and leadership capacity.

Dr. John Finger at Colgate University has developed a Personal Values Inventory which endeavors to determine motivation and chances for success. He has proposed the idea, tentatively, that persistance and aggressiveness are positively correlated with success.

Another interesting method of selection is used by the consortium which includes the two Marymounts, Manhattan College, Mercy College, and Mount Saint Vincent. The community centers accept students for a spring tutorial program. The ones who succeed go on to a summer remedial program; the successful summer students are then admitted to the fall program. This self-selection method enables students to prove themselves.

Many schools rely on community agencies to screen or recruit applicants.

In many of the CUNY programs, currently enrolled students are actively involved in the recruitment of opportunity students in their own communities and neighborhoods.

Small upstate colleges in the more rural areas have been

recruiting eligible HEOP applicants from more distant urban areas. The consequence, frequently, is a heavy drain on the recruiting budgets.

Tutoring

A wide range of approaches to tutoring is found in HEOP programs. In the more effective programs, the tutoring is closely coordinated between instructor, tutor and student. The tutor is paid for actual time spent in tutoring, for meeting with the instructor to determine the students' needs, and for time spent in planning.

In good programs, the HEOP office often provides a place for the student and tutor to meet and provides a textbook library and other materials the tutor might require. In the better programs, tutors are given training in workshops. Good programs also include a close followup of the tutoring process including progress reports provided by the tutors, regular contacting of instructors to identify students in danger of failing, and consistent followup of the students who need tutoring to make sure they are actually getting the help they need.

Tutors are drawn from several sources. They may be instructors, graduate students, able students--HEOP and regular--in their second, third, or fourth years. The CUNY SEEK programs are now able to employ their more mature SEEK students in tutoring. Tutors may be either paid or voluntary. The experience seems to be that paid tutors in a structured program are more effective and more consistently available than volunteers in a structured program.

Two types of tutoring service tend to be found in most SEEK programs. One is a tutoring workshop in which one tutor works intensively with three to seven students in one specific area. The second is traditional individual tutoring. In the larger programs, a tutoring coordinator works closely with instructors and counselors and identifies students in need of tutoring. In smaller programs, the counselor may coordinate the student's tutoring needs. In some programs, the tutor works in close relationship with the course instructor to determine more accurately the specific help needed by the student. An important point to add is that as more and more SEEK students become upperclassmen, those with the highest academic achievement and ability are being employed as tutors for beginning SEEK students.

The least effective tutoring programs are those in which it is left to the student to decide when and in which subjects he needs tutoring. It is often difficult for the student to admit to anyone, even to himself, that he is in academic trouble and he often cannot bring himself to ask for help. He may procrastinate so long that failure becomes a virtual certainty. In evening programs for HEOP students that have full-time employment, the sheer weight of finding and scheduling tutoring hours frequently defeats the program.

Curriculum

A variety of curriculum adjustments have been made by colleges to improve the chances for HEOP student success. A minimal adjustment has been the enrollment of students for lighter course loads and for a balance of courses selected to protect the student from taking too many difficult courses at one time. This procedure leaves the college program intact and has the effect of prolonging the period of time the student must take to complete college.

More extensive curriculum changes have involved the design of special college level courses focusing on content particularly relevant to HEOP students. These include such courses as Black studies, Latin American History, and social science courses that emphasize methods and concepts that enable the student to attempt to define and solve social problems.

Team teaching that emphasizes the drawing together of various disciplines and integrates the development of the skills of study with the learning of academic concepts has also been utilized. This interdisciplinary approach was attempted in the TEAM program at Suffolk Community College.

The practice of dividing courses in such a way that the student can proceed at his own rate is a practice that has potential for success.

Flexibility in course requirements, coupled with the development of more effective instructional materials, are also slowly evolving.

Remediation

Special remedial courses and programs are found in many of the college programs studied. Designed to provide basic skills development, they are offered in the summer preceding entrance into the Freshman year.

In many programs, special noncredit skill development and compensatory educational courses have been developed. The student may be registered in these courses entirely, or he may take one or two selected regular college courses and enroll in remedial courses for the balance of the program. Basic difficulties with remedial courses exist. The students enrolled in them often resent being singled out as special or less able and they feel they are not doing "real college work." The fact that these courses have no

college credit to be earned is also resented. A recurrent problem with noncredit remedial courses has been that of maintaining motivation to study. Irregular attendance, failure to do assignments, and frequent lateness are often symptoms of this difficulty. Finally, each noncredit course means further postponement of the students' achievement of his college goals.

There has been some tendency, therefore,to integrate remediation with regular college programs and to move the student as soon as possible into regular courses, usually on a reduced load basis; sometimes, special attention being given to skills development within the context of the academic courses.

One remediation solution lies in the special education centers such as the Cooperative College Center in Mt. Vernon. Here, students take a college credit program which is entirely remedial, but they are not on a regular college campus. As soon as they are ready, they are integrated into the regular programs at the campuses. This is also true of the program run by the Urban Center of Hudson Valley Community College.

A standard practice in SEEK has been to offer a series of noncredit courses aimed primarily at mastery of basic skills in English, reading, and mathematics. These courses are designed to raise the performance levels of SEEK students. These courses focus on writing skills, advanced reading skills, study skills, and other areas deemed vital for success in college.

The instructors for remedial courses are often not members of the general college staff but are a part of a special staff and responsible to the HEOP director. Noncredit courses may be taught by special staff members.

Summer Programs

Summer programs are offered in many of the colleges. They vary in duration from one to several weeks. Most of them emphasize orientation to college, and training in basic academic skills. At some colleges, consideration is being given to granting college credit for some portions of the students' work in the summer program; a few colleges such as Utica, Marist, and Colgate already grant such credit.

A few of the summer programs give special attention to the personality aspects of readiness for college. The Hofstra University NOAH program employs a psychologist during the summer program to work with entering students, helping them to become more aware of themselves as functioning individuals and to form a deeper identification with the NOAH program and the students in it. Colgate University, in its program, emphasized orientation and motivational training. Corning Community College also had an intensive achievement motivational training program.

Community Involvement

Marymount Manhattan, Mt. St. Vincent and Fordham, acting in a consortia, SUNY-Buffalo, and SUNY-Binghamton have storefront operations in the ghetto communities. The operations serve as intake centers for prospective students. These community projects are excellent.

Union College has a community tutoring program which serves as a link between the campus and the city.

At Monroe Community College the students from the Black Students Union do community work and the Urban Center provides resources for remedial work. Nazareth College and Suffolk Community College are also active in their communities.

At Hofstra University and the State University Agricultural and Technical College at Farmingdale, community figures serve as advisors for the program.

At New York University the HEOP students have planned a summer program in the community which will provide a day care center, tutoring, and athletic activities.

The HEOP students at Marymount-Tarrytown live and work in the community while attending school. The purpose of the program is to educate the students to serve their communities. The Wyandanch Center for Higher Education,in its narcotics program and training of paraprofessionals, aims to educate its members to serve the community.

Facilities

Most of the colleges provide special office facilities for the director of the program. In many instances, support staff are also housed together. Their availability and closeness create a more unified and consistent program. Black Student Centers and special student areas have also helped students to feel accepted.

Marymount-Manhattan College has developed a Speech and Hearing Center and a Special Reading Center for HEOP students. In the same vein, Wagner College has a Reading Laboratory and a Learning Laboratory. SUC at Oneonta and SUNY-Buffalo also have reading laboratories.

Rockland Community College has set up two separate facilities devoted to remedial and part-time education of the disadvantaged. Rockland Community College has two centers: Haverstraw to serve the Puerto Rican community and Spring Valley to serve the Black community. Transportation difficulties have prevented many students from these communities from attending classes on the campus of Rockland Community College.

In many HEOP programs, however, the students have been amalgamated into the total college and utilize those facilities available to the whole student body.

Personal Financial Allowances

Colgate University's emergency fund allows students with financial problems to obtain additional funds. The willingness on the part of the school to take such a risk should be noticed by other schools.

Marymount-Tarrytown arranges jobs for students to earn spending money. Almost all institutions have some form of work-study program.

Marist College and the CUNY-Bilingual Program provide extra money according to the need of the student. The former has a special overall financial program in which the college pays all expenses through loans, summer jobs, or part-time work.

Several colleges provide help in budgeting,and assistance with the completion of financial forms.

In some of the programs, no weekly allowances, with the exception of the emergency loans, are available. In the EOP Program at Brooklyn College and the NOAH Project at Hofstra University, the lack of financial allowances created severe difficulties for many students. Weekly allowances are paid to SEEK students and are crucial to their success. The allowances range from nothing to $50 per week, averaging about $30 per week per student. The actual allowance is set on the basis of individual need as determined by the counselor in consultation with the student.

Many colleges, from their own resources, provide financial assistance to students.The limited funds available did not make it possible for HEOP to support personal stipends.

Student Activity Involvement

Monroe Community College, The University of Rochester, and the University Center of City College have made special

efforts to include HEOP students in school activities and organizations.

Nazareth College has developed a program designed to promote better understanding and better student relationships.

Often, however, especially in the predominantly white, small town colleges, minority group students from the large cities feel an intense sense of isolation. They find little to do, few people to talk to and, because of poor transportation facilities, they lack the mobility to establish personal contacts.

Work Experiences

The field experience offered by work-study programs at Keuka College and elsewhere shows ways of increasing the relevancy of the programs for students.

At Hofstra University, NOAH students are employed, when possible, in community surveys, social action projects, and as field workers in sponsored research projects.

The CUNY SEEK and Hofstra NOAH programs regularly employ more mature students in these programs as tutors.

Several programs attempt to employ students in work-study activities that are related to their fields of academic or professional interests.

Housing

Colgate University and Corning Community College have established committees to set up and monitor housing policies in the community. The actions of these committees have not only allowed the students to live off campus, but have alerted citizens to the needs of both the special students and the colleges. Help often follows understanding, and this has been the case with these two committees.

The open housing policy which allows freedom of choice at Ithaca College has resulted in a wide distribution of

HEOP students throughout the campus. Binghamton uses student counselors in dorms which provides for effective feedback mechanisms, although this practice may be changed because students now have requested their own facilities.

Students have been totally integrated into campus housing at Marist College, Wagner College, and Marymount College in Tarrytown. In most cases, transition has been smooth and integration carried out without incident.

Group Identification with the HEOP Program

Student identification with the HEOP Program is strong in most colleges.This example is drawn from the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) at Brooklyn College.

The students are strongly identified with their group and see their program as something distinct and special. This strong in-group feeling was probably engendered originally by the leadership of the project director and was perhaps accentuated by the fact that many of them felt that as economically or educationally deprived students they had entered hostile territory in a predominantly academic setting. Currently, this in-group feeling is so strong that it is probably self-perpetuating.

This deep feeling of common cause and empathy has some important consequences which should be considered in planning HEOP types of programs. It seems to play an important role in the retention power of the program. Only 7 out of 400 students failed or left the program at the end of the current school year. Students seem to feel responsibility for each other. This social force provides support for the individual student when he is having academic difficulties or when he is confronted with personal problems at home. A student feels

the pressure and concern of his peers if he fails to attend class, or misses an examination, or doesn't study. It is these dynamics that probably make it possible for the program to operate with such a minimal project staff, and only two counselors.

An important adjunct to identification with the project is that the students, through an elected advisory committee to the director, have always been completely knowledgeable and involved in all of the workings of the program, including budgeting. In a very real sense, it is their program.

Dynamics of the type operating in this program, could be studied to provide insights into how some HEOP Programs might be redirected or reorganized.

CHAPTER III

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE PROGRAM

The legislation authorizing HEOP was quite specific in detailing the use to which state funds could be put.

Table 2 depicts the importance of the program elements from the standpoint of the approved budgets for state aid purposes. State aid approvals are shown for credit instruction, noncredit instruction and remediation, tutoring, counseling,stipends, central administration and coordination, and travel.

In addition, the table shows the size of the HEOP enrollment in comparison with the total undergraduate enrollment.

And finally, the table gives the approved per student state aid grant.

Institutions are shown individually in the table and grouped by SUNY(4-year units), CUNY (including oommunity colleges under the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York), public community colleges (excluding those in the City of New York), and private institutions.

Per Student State Aid Allocations

Table 2 shows the per student HEOP state aid allocations for each college in the program. They range between $100 and $2500, with the average between $500 and $600.

These computations were based on HARC estimates of the numbers of students in each program and the state aid allocations reported by the State Education Department.

In any case, these per student grants are the results of State Education Department funding decisions. These decisions took into account a combination of factors:

1. The amount of financial commitment made by the institution over state and federal grants (Scholar Incentive, Work Study, EOG, NDSL).

2. The experience and success of previous opportunity programs.
3. The need for smaller "seed" money to get programs started.
4. The results of proposal evaluations by nationally recognized professional educational consultants.

The per student allocations do not reflect the cost of the programs. Other funds (state, federal, institutional) supplemented these grants. But it was not possible to get reliable data on these supplements.

Program Elements

State aid allocations to HEOP programs in the various institutions were approved for credit instruction, noncredit instruction and remediation, tutoring, counseling, stipends, central administration, and miscellaneous activities. In terms of percentage of the total dollar volume they ranked as follows:

1.	Stipends (tuition, books, room, board, food, transportation	36.9
2.	Counseling	20.6
3.	Central Administration	11.8
4.	Tutoring	11.0
5.	Credit Instruction	10.4
6.	Noncredit Instruction and Remediation	8.6
7.	Travel	0.7

HEOP Enrollment

Total HEOP enrollment benefiting from state aid grants was slightly in excess of 8,500. The private institutions enrolled 1,455, SUNY enrolled 1,462, CUNY enrolled 5,146, and Community Colleges enrolled 474.

Total undergraduate enrollments in the participating colleges during 1969-70 stood at 267,137. Thus HEOP enrollment is slightly in excess of 3% of the undergraduate enrollment.

Characteristics of HEOP Students

The characteristics of HEOP students as reported here were based on results of a survey conducted shortly after the beginning of the school year.

The ages of HEOP students varied widely; however, 78% were under 23 years of age.

Female students were in the majority; 45% were male.

Black students were in the majority. Blacks constituted 64%, Puerto Rican 13% and others (mainly white) constituted 23%.

Single students were 78% of the total, 17% were married, and another 5% were divorced or separated.

The distribution of these students by father's occupation showed the unskilled to dominate, followed closely by the semi-skilled. Among these students 31% had fathers with unskilled occupations, 24% semi-skilled, 19% skilled, 8% professional, and 18% deceased.

The overwhelming majority of the families of these students received no income from social welfare rolls. Only 11% received all their income from welfare and another 4% received some of their income from this source.

Most of the students received academic diplomas from high school graduation. Only 25% received other than an academic diploma.

Most received some high school counseling. Only 36% did not receive such counseling.

A majority received no high school tutoring. This constituted 60% of the students.

A slight majority of 51% were receiving some college counseling.

A majority were not receiving any college tutoring. Some 62% of the students were in this category.

Sixty-five percent of the students did not work. Only 6% worked between 1 and 5 hours a day; 29% worked over 5 hours a day.

About a third of the students were taking a normal course load of 10-12 credit hours per semester, another third were

taking between 0-9 hours and another third were taking over 12 hours.

A slight majority of 53% of the students are taking some noncredit courses.

A distribution of these students by family income shows 87% to be from families with incomes below $7,000 per year; 12% from families with incomes between $7,000 and $10,000; only 1% are from families with incomes over $10,000 per year.

Student Retention Rates

The rate of retention of HEOP students in all the institutions participating in the program was 93%. This is probably the most important statistic describing these students. Implicit in the law authorizing the HEOP program is the extension of college opportunities to the economically and educationally disadvantaged student. A measure of the success of this objective is not only the number entering the program but, in the last analysis, how many successfully complete the program. But to complete the program means to remain throughout the normal span of college-going years.

Table 3 relates the retention rates to various student characteristics. Those characteristics may be distinguished which are related to retention and attrtion rates.

Age provides no criterion in regard to retention rates. No matter what the age group, the retention rate seems to be almost identical to that for the group as a whole.

Sex of the students appears to differentiate retention rates. Males have a retention rate slightly above the average while females have a rate slightly below the average.

Ethnic status seems to cause significant differences in retention rates. Black students have a retention rate close to the average, Puerto Rican students have a rate slightly below the average; but white students have a retention rate well above the average.

Marital status also appears to differentiate retention rates. Married students have above average rates; single and divorced students are well below the average.

Occupational status of fathers is the characteristic which shows the greatest differences in retention rates. Students with fathers in the professions have a retention rate of 100%; those with fathers in skilled work have a rate of 98%. Those with fathers in the semi-skilled category have rates slightly below the average and those whose fathers are deceased,are far below average.

Hours worked by students is related to continued enrollment. Those who do not work have retention rates above the average; those who work have rates far below the average.

Occupational Goals of HEOP Students

The distribution of HEOP students by occupational goals shows that almost one-fourth are undecided. The other three-fourths are interested in a fairly wide range of occupations.

Education	27%
Law and Medicine	14
Sociology	14
Sciences	7
Business	6
Others	8
Undecided	24

Table 2

Approved State Aid Allocations For HEOP Activities In Participating Institutions Classified By Type New York State, 1969–70

Institution	Student Enrollment: Total Undergraduates	Student Enrollment: HEOP	Credit Instruction	Non-credit Instruction and Remediation	Tutoring	Counseling	Stipends	Central Administration and Coordination	Travel and Other	Total	Total per Student
PRIVATE											
Colgate University	2013	10	$ 0	$ 0	$ 4825	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 4825	$ 482
Fordham University	7440	220	8000	0	5000	9000	20500	10000	500	53000	240
Hamilton-Kirkland Colleges	1221	21	0	1000	500	5500	0	0	1000	8000	380
Hofstra University	8108	77	26550	0	2500	10000	3300	1715	0	44065	572
Ithaca College	3823	40	0	0	9920	1400	69300	1880	0	82500	2050
Keuka College	844	14	1200	0	2109	800	456	0	0	4565	326
LeMoyne College	1635	10	0	1200	4000	1650	1000	600	0	8450	845
Manhattan College	3902	20	3875	8000	0	3000	1500	5050	700	22125	1106
Manhattanville College	1334	20	900	3545	2500	2000	17000	3655	400	30000	1500
Marist College	1712	20	5000	0	1000	5000	1500	2630	100	15230	760
Marymount-Tarrytown College	1089	15	2000	1050	6000	4200	1575	100	100	15025	1001
Marymount Manhattan College	615	55	400	7000	2400	0	15500	7140	600	33040	601
Mercy College	906	15	0	11400	1400	600	1175	4125	200	18900	1260
Mount Saint Mary College	687	18	0	600	3360	2844	310	1286	0	8400	467
Mount Saint Vincent	957	9	4000	4500	0	3000	0	4025	1150	16675	1853
Nazareth College	1411	10	6500	1500	3000	2000	0	2500	0	15500	1550
New York University	12679	535	54000	19500	31083	101500	0	33917	0	240000	449
Notre Dame College	436	25	0	0	6400	4500	6250	5185	50	22385	895
RPI-Skidmore-Union	7703	56	0	0	6250	6250	0	0	0	12500	223
Syracuse University College		115	0	5200	3500	11000	17800	12000	500	50000	435
Syracuse University	9166	47	2000	1200	0	2400	3300	9400	100	18400	391
University of Rochester	5208	51	4000	15000	3420	11420	41250	19910	2000	97000	1902
Utica College	3126	28	0	16490	19000	11500	17700	5272	500	70462	2517
Wagner College	2709	24	0	0	6400	4500	6250	5185	50	22385	933
Total Private	78724	1455	118425	97185	124567	204064	225666	135575	7950	913432	628
Percent of Total Private Allocations			13.0%	10.6%	13.6%	22.3%	24.7%	14.8%	0.9%	100.0%	

Table 2

Approved State Aid Allocations For HEOP Activities In Participating Institutions Classified By Type New York State, 1969–70

	Total Undergraduates	HEOP	Credit Instruction	Non-credit Instruction and Remediation	Tutoring	Counseling	Stipends	Central Administration and Coordination	Travel	Total	Total per Student
SUNY											
SUNY–Albany	8378	320	$ 0	$ 10000	$ 5000	$ 0	$ 133500	$ 0	$ 1500	$ 150000	$ 469
SUNY–Binghamton	4419	82	0	0	17025	13800	12000	0	1500	44325	541
SUNY–Buffalo	15157	310	0	0	0	0	133000	0	0	133000	429
SUC–Cortland	3892	47	0	1379	3900	5400	3000	0	0	13679	291
SUC–Old Westbury	225	225	30000	0	12000	29500	61000	5160	2950	140610	625
SUC–Oneonta	4692	117	0	0	3000	0	0	0	0	3000	26
SUC–Oswego	6121	54	0	0	0	0	7500	0	4000	11500	2130
SUC–Purchase	0	207	43300	0	0	46317	96600	23923	0	210140	1015
Total SUNY	42884	1462	73300	11379	40925	95017	446600	29083	9950	706254	483
Percent of Total SUNY Allocations			10.4%	1.6%	5.8%	13.5%	63.2%	4.1%	1.4%	100%	
CUNY											
Brooklyn College	19428	466	20500	0	32250	55250	27500	60800	1000	197300	423
CUNY Bilingual	88495	45	11250	40000	12960	10500	17100	12250	250	104310	2318
CUNY SEEK	88495	4300	0	1229205	71250	142500	764308	205770	0	2413033	561
Hunter College	13078	209	0	7750	10000	42000	15000	5460	0	80210	384
Richmond College	1361	45	0	0	8100	9000	3750	3500	200	24550	546
Staten Island Community College	5591	40	0	0	4000	9000	4720	7150	200	25070	627
Staten Island Community College (Community Scholar Program)	5591	41	4320	0	4500	9000	8680	3500	0	30000	732
Total CUNY	95447	5146	36070	1276955	143060	277250	841058	298430	1650	2874473	559
Percent of Total CUNY Allocations			1.3%	44.4%	5.0%	9.6%	29.3%	10.4%	0%	100.0%	

Table 2

Approved State Aid Allocations For HEOP Activities
In Participating Institutions Classified By Type
New York State, 1969–70

	Total Undergraduates	HEOP	Credit Instruction	Non-credit Instruction and Remediation	Tutoring	Counseling	Stipends	Central Administration and Coordination	Travel	Total	Total per Student
COMMUNITY COLLEGES											
SU A&T–Cobleskill	1738	25	$ 0	$ 15000	$ 0	$ 5250	$ 1875	$ 0	$ 0	$ 22125	$ 885
SU A&T–Farmingdale	9599	91	0	10000	4430	10500	60000	2870	0	87800	965
Corning Community College	2960	25	0	5850	2400	0	0	0	0	8250	330
Erie Community College	6189	35	9600	4670	3950	9600	25925	6142	0	59887	171
Hudson Valley Community College	5402	16	0	4000	0	0	3850	0	0	7850	491
Mohawk Valley Community College	3589	30	0	0	1200	2625	0	0	100	3925	131
Monroe Community College	7565	83	0	0	0	9600	14600	1344	0	25544	308
Rockland Community College	4046	119	0	8400	0	9000	11600	9000	0	38000	319
Suffolk Community College	8984	50	12500	0	13500	12500	15000	5390	0	58890	1178
Total Community College	50082	474	22100	47920	25480	59075	132850	24746	100	312271	659
Percent of Total Community College Allocations			7.1%	15.3%	8.2%	18.9%	42.5%	7.9%	0%	100.0%	
Total State	267137	8537	249895	1433439	334032	635406	1646174	487834	19650	4806430	
Percent of Total State Allocations			5.2%	29.8%	6.9%	13.2%	34.2%	10.1%	0%	100.0%	

TABLE 3

PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
IN RELATION TO STUDENT RETENTION STATUS IN PROGRAM
NEW YORK STATE, 1969-70

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	RETENTION STATUS	
	Retained	Dropped
ALL STUDENTS	92.6%	7.4%
1. Age in Years		
a. under 23	92.7	7.3
b. 23 and over	92.0	8.0
2. Sex		
a. Male	93.8	6.2
b. Female	90.7	9.3
3. Ethnic Status		
a. Black	91.8	8.2
b. Puerto Rican	90.0	10.0
c. Other	96.0	4.0
4. Marital Status		
a. Married	94.6	5.4
b. Single	86.0	14.0
c. Other	81.1	18.9
5. Father's Occupation		
a. Professional	100.0	0
b. Skilled	98.2	1.8
c. Semi-Skilled	90.2	9.8
d. Unskilled	93.5	6.5
e. Deceased	87.9	12.1
6. Hours of Work per Week		
a. None	95.5	4.5
b. 1-5	85.7	14.3
c. Over 5	87.7	12.3

CHAPTER IV

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Coordinating Role of the State Education Department

The 1970 amendments to the education law have effectively divided the HEOP program into three parts -- SUNY, CUNY, and the private colleges. The law retains, however, the original language of the coordinating role of the Regents. This role is now rendered vague. For all practical purposes, the Regents will coordinate only the private sector.

It is recommended that the HEOP staff of the State Education Department be given a stronger role in the coordination of the HEOP program in all institutions -- public and private -- throughout the State.

Only the Board of Regents has the power to perform such a coordinating role.

HEOP needs a focus and an overall programmatic philosophy. Uniform standards and policies with respect to the major elements of the program should be established while, at the same time, individual college initiative should be encouraged. Furthermore, a central disseminating unit would provide information feedback to all the colleges.

The State HEOP office is seriously understaffed. Many of the colleges operating HEOP programs are in need of, and have requested, consultative help for the improvement of their programs. There are not nearly enough human resources to do this adequately.

It is recommended that funds be provided to increase the HEOP staff of the State Education Department by at least five qualified professionals and supporting clerical-stenographic assistants.

There is a need for the sharing of educational approaches, materials and ideas among programs. This could be accomplished through conferences, intervisitation, and the expansion of such publications as the Educational Opportunity Forum.

It is therefore recommended that the state HEOP staff should play a greater leadership role in program development and dissemination.

Funding of HEOP

The amount of funds provided to the HEOP by the New York State Legislature during its first year of operation was $5 million. The Legislature is commended for this initial effort,but the size of the appropriation does not compare favorably with the size of the problem to be solved.

It is strongly recommended that a cutoff minimum grant be adhered to by the State Education Department. It is a further recommendation that this minimum be set in terms of two criteria -- $4,000 per student and $100,000 per institution. Either of the two criteria is assumed to include other related state and federal grants such as Scholar Incentive, Work-Study, EOG, NDSL. The per student recommendation insures that the State contribution will in fact bear the brunt of the burden for the program. The per institution recommendation insures that there is a sufficient number of students (a minimum of 25) in the program to give it identity, cohesiveness, and significant dimension.

It is recommended that additional financial assistance be provided for personal needs of HEOP students. This recommendation could be implemented in at least three ways, namely, (1) increased in direct aid to students; (2) increasing student employment possibilities; and (3) a combination of items 1 and 2.

Planning of HEOP Programs

The State HEOP guidelines urge student and faculty involvement in HEOP programs. Community representation on such groups is also called for in the guidelines. HARC strongly recommends that such involvement be continued and strengthened. The State HEOP staff provided consistent help to many institutions during the year to this end. HARC emphasizes the suggestion that more institutions avail themselves of these services.

It is urged that small upstate colleges exert greater effort to recruit HEOP students from their local geographical areas. This recommendation does not preclude recruiting HEOP students from other than local geographical areas.

It is recommended that HEOP students be integrated into regular college classes whenever possible. Remedial classes established specifically for HEOP students should be more directly related to the regular on-going curriculum of participating institutions.

Cooperation between Colleges

The concept of consortium is one that should be used more extensively. Small colleges or colleges with limited resources could, when they are geographically contiguous, perhaps create stronger programs when they pool resources of human talent, student services, and facilities.

Feeder schools that prepare students for admission to 2- or 4-year colleges have, and should continue to be, developed under the consortium arrangement.

A Statewide Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged

The Higher Education Opportunity Program for 1969-70 was limited by the amount of funding and the restrictions of section 6451 of the education law. The level of State financial support was far short of the dimensions of the problems in providing higher education for economically disadvantaged students.

The past year's program operated under the coordination of a special unit of the Division of Higher and Professional Education of the State Education Department. Funds for opportunity programs are now divided among three units--SUNY, CUNY and the private colleges, with funds for the private sector administered by the State Education Department. The rationale for this reorganization is greater coordination. Despite the intent, HARC foresees less coordination during the coming year.

It is recommended that a statewide conference, attended by representatives of all aspects of HEOP, be called in the near future to examine the legal structure and overall funding of HEOP. The participants would include members of the co-ordinating unit of HEOP at the state level; directors and other key personnel of HEOP funded in CUNY, SUNY, and private colleges; key administrative officers of the colleges; and specialists in the development of higher education programs for disadvantaged students.

Some changes to this conference should include:

1. A summarization of the status of present HEOP programs.
2. A summarization of the dimensions of actual need for HEOP programs.
3. A critique of the adequacy of existing and planned programs to meet these higher education opportunity needs.
4. The legislative design of a program in broad outline that would make possible the funding of all aspects of an academic program to meet the needs of the disadvantaged students.
5. The draft of a plan of action to obtain the organization, resources, and legislation to develop this program.

The size of the student population to be served by HEOP programs and the social costs of failing to serve these students effectively are so great that the development of these programs cannot be left to caprice. A broader legal framework, sound programming, and adequate financing are desperately needed to give collegiate opportunity programs a chance for ultimate success.

CHAPTER V

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF HEOP

The Medium in Which HEOP Operates

HEOP operates within an environment consisting of 212 accredited institutions of higher learning in New York State.

In terms of administrative control, these institutions are public, private, and a combination of public and private. The latter are privately operated under contract with the State.

Among the public institutions are units of the State University of New York, units of the City University of New York, and the Community College System. Units of the latter system may, in turn, be jointly financed by the state and local governments (including the City of New York).

The private institutions are controlled by secular boards, by religious orders, or by a combination of both.

The 212 institutions range in size from a handful of students to approximately 40,000. They operate undergraduate programs of two or four years. Some have graduate and professional schools.

The total enrollments in all institutions in New York State was over 700,000 full-and part-time students. Of these, 562,000 were undergraduates; 12,000 were black or Puerto Rican students.

The 212 institutions spend more than $1.5 billion annually. About 27% of the funds are provided by student fees, 16% by the federal government, and 24% by State and local governments. The remainder is from other sources.

The public institutions spend $500 million annually at present. In addition, a multi-billion dollar construction program is well under way. State, local, and federal governments supply 75% of the operating revenues.

In total, HEOP financed programs in some 60 institutions of higher learning in New York State. The program enrolled an estimated 8,500 students, and about 6,000 of these (70%) were black or Puerto Rican.

Thus, HEOP enrolled 50% of the total black and Puerto Rican students in all the higher educational institutions of the State, 1.2% of the entire higher education student population, and 1.5% of the entire undergraduate population. It is therefore an effective instrument for getting black and Puerto Rican students admitted to the college community. In terms of size and financing, however, it is a relatively small enterprise in the higher education milieu of New York State.

The Legal Framework

The legislation authorizing the program is very specific in its restrictions on what can be done. Activities are limited to such things as screening, testing, remedial courses, tutoring, counseling, summer classes, guidance, stipends, and central administration.

The law also specifies that the funds cannot be used to support the regular academic program. Furthermore, any expenditure must not conflict with the Regents statewide plan for higher education.

The target population is restricted to New York State students who are disadvantaged but have a potential for completing a college curriculum.

Some Implications

The evaluation study took the legal framework as a structure within which the assessment of the program was to be conducted. No attempt was made to challenge the framework as an appropriate set of conditions for the successful realization of HEOP's prime objective--the expansion of equal educational opportunity. In light of dynamic changes taking place in higher

education and in consideration of the social and political movements of the day, the legal framework of HEOP, however, may be too confining.

High school preparation, academic qualifications, admission policies, and all the related factors in college-going have resulted, empirically, in relatively few black and Puerto Rican students in attendance at the colleges of the State. No institution nor individual can be accused of consciously designing this condition. Nevertheless, the condition prevails; but it is also empirically true that HEOP's deliberate attempts at remedy have succeeded in getting a number of these students into the colleges. But the rub is to keep them there through graduation.

The legal framework, however, provides very little alternative to the colleges to do the kind of total job that is called for. That framework assumes that the target student is deficient in certain attributes and it is the job of the institution to remedy that deficiency. The events of the last few years seem to point to different reasoning. This reasoning assumes that the student comes to the college with great potential for learning and teaching; he comes with many contributions to make to the institution. To accommodate this type of student, the burden is on the institution to reassess its function and institute necessary changes in itself.

Most of the students in HEOP are from the cities. The major efforts of the late 20th century will continue to be dominated by the problems of the cities. Colleges must reach out to marshal all the resources of the rich institutional complexes of the city which can make a contribution to the education of students. But this will take greater efforts than the HEOP legislation now prescribes.

What is needed most urgently now is a repeal of those restricted provisions of law which circumscribe the potential usefulness of the HEOP. A conference of involved university officials, students, potential students, and parents should be convened to work out a program of action and to draft enabling legislation. The State Education Department should convene such a statewide conference forthwith to bring light to bear on one of the more pressing issues of the day -- expansion of equal educational opportunities.